

Diffeomorphism invariant $SU(N)$ gauge theories

Viqar Husain*

*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of British Columbia,
6224 Agricultural Road
Vancouver, BC V6T1Z1, Canada*

Abstract

We describe a class of diffeomorphism invariant $SU(N)$ gauge theories in N^2 dimensions, together with some matter couplings. These theories have $(N^2 - 3)(N^2 - 1)$ local degrees of freedom, and have the unusual feature that the constraint associated with time reparametrizations is identically satisfied. A related class of $SU(N)$ theories in $N^2 - 1$ dimensions has the constraint algebra of general relativity, but has more degrees of freedom. Non-perturbative quantization of the first type of theory via $SU(N)$ spin networks is briefly outlined.

PACS numbers: 11.15.-q, 04.20.Cv, 04.20.Fy, 04.60.Ds

Typeset using REVTeX

*Email: husain@physics.ubc.ca

Generally covariant theories have the well known feature that their Hamiltonia are linear combinations of constraints in the canonical formulation. The Poisson algebra of constraints in the Hamiltonian theory normally reflects all the spacetime symmetries of the covariant theory. This is the case in theories such as general relativity and supergravity, in which the spacetime metric is non-degenerate in general. The constraint associated with time reparametrization plays a dual role: it may be viewed as generating both unphysical gauge transformations on phase space variables because of its origin, and physical “time-evolution” because it gives the rule for evolving initial data from one spatial surface to the next. A true non-vanishing Hamiltonian appears only after a time gauge fixing is made; physical evolution is then unambiguous, but is with respect to the gauge choice.

The normal expectation is that all local invariances of an action are manifested in the Hamiltonian theory via distinct first class constraints. However there are two known exceptions.

The first is a theory with general coordinate and $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills invariance in four spacetime dimensions [1]. The fields are spacetime dreibeins e_a^i and gauge fields A_a^i , where $a = 0, \dots, 3$ is the spacetime index and $i = 1, \dots, 3$ is the $SU(2)$ index. The fields are therefore in the adjoint representation. The action is

$$S_4[e, A] = \int \eta_{ijk} e^i \wedge e^j \wedge F^k(A), \quad (1)$$

where $F(A) = dA + [A, A]$ is the curvature of A_a^i , and η_{ijk} is the $su(2)$ anti-symmetric tensor. This theory has been analyzed in detail in [1]. The phase space coordinates are exactly those of $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory. However, the dynamics is (obviously) different: the Hamiltonian turns out to be a linear combination of the Gauss law and spatial diffeomorphism constraint. The surprising feature of this theory is that *the constraint corresponding to time reparametrization invariance vanishes identically*.

The second theory is a generalization of Chern-Simons theory to all odd dimensions higher than three. The action is again invariant under general coordinate and Yang-Mills gauge transformations, but unlike (1), is a functional of a single gauge field [2,3]. The Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ for the $(2n+1)$ -dimensional theory is defined via

$$d\mathcal{L}^{2n+1} = g_{i_1 \dots i_{n+1}} F^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge F^{i_{n+1}}, \quad (2)$$

where now the gauge group may be $SU(N)$ rather than just $SU(2)$ as in (1), and $g_{i_1 \dots i_{n+1}}$ is a symmetric Lie algebra tensor of rank $n+1$ constructed from the structure constants. For $n > 2$ these theories have local degrees of freedom. The Hamiltonian-Dirac analysis reveals the feature that the time-reparametrization constraint arises as a linear combination of internal Yang-Mills transformations and spatial diffeomorphisms: *there is no independent time diffeomorphism constraint* [2].

One of the main differences between these two theories at the Hamiltonian level is that in the first there is *no* combination of first class constraints that gives the time diffeomorphism constraint, while in the second this is the case. Furthermore, the phase space coordinates themselves are different: the coordinates for the second theory are spatial components of the gauge field as is usual for Chern-Simons theory, rather than electric and connection fields as in the first theory. Finally, while (2) is defined in all odd dimensions, it appears at first sight that (1) can be defined only in four dimensions, and only for $SU(2)$. Indeed, if the

group is taken to be $SO(3,1)$, (1) is an action for general relativity. For groups with more than three generators (in four spacetime dimensions), the time diffeomorphism constraint is always present in the Hamiltonian formulation.

In this note we point out that there are in fact higher dimensional theories of the general form (1). We will see that this type of action, with the vanishing Hamiltonian constraint property, may be written down only for spacetime dimensions which are specific functions of the number of generators of the internal group. The vanishing Hamiltonian constraint means that “dynamics” effectively amounts to the kinematics of general relativity in the respective dimensions. This makes the theories integrable quantum mechanically, as is the case [4] for the $SU(2)$ theory (1). Finally, we discuss possible matter couplings, and point out that there is another class of $SU(N)$ gauge theory in $N^2 - 1$ dimensions which has a canonical constraint algebra *identical* to the 4-dimensional general relativity constraint algebra in the Ashtekar formulation. This theory, however, has more degrees of freedom than general relativity in the same dimension. This demonstrates that identical constraint algebras need not imply identical theories classically or quantum mechanically.

The key input responsible for the absence of the Hamiltonian constraint in the theory (1) is that the 4-dimensional action is a functional of dreibeins e_a^i . This means that the spacetime metric $g_{ab} = e_a^i e_b^j \delta_{ij}$ is degenerate with signature $(0+++)$. One can attempt to formulate similar higher dimensional theories with degenerate metrics. For example, for a 5-dimensional theory we would like to have a degenerate covariant metric of signature $(0++++)$, and might try $SO(4)$ (or $SO(3,1)$ etc.) as the internal gauge group. However, this does not work because there is no way to form a gauge scalar lagrangian density of the desired type: the anti-symmetric tensor on the group is the Levi-Civita tensor η^{ijkl} , whereas the would be 5-form lagrangian density is

$$e^i \wedge e^j \wedge e^k \wedge F^{lm}. \quad (3)$$

Thus tracing of internal indices, for group $SO(4)$, isn't possible. The same problem occurs for all higher dimensions with $SO(N)$ groups.

For $SU(N)$ groups, however, it is possible to write down higher dimensional actions of the form (1) because the gauge field carries one internal index rather than an antisymmetrized pair as for $SO(N)$. But now the requirement that the spacetime metric be degenerate is possible only in certain dimensions. To see this consider $SU(3)$ as an example: the field e_a^i ($i = 1, \dots, 8$) gives a degenerate metric via $g_{ab} = e_a^i e_b^j k_{ij}$ (where k_{ij} is the Cartan metric), only if the spacetime dimension is nine.

More generally it is possible to write down degenerate metric theories of this type with internal gauge group $SU(N)$ only if the spacetime dimension is N^2 . The action is

$$S^{N^2} = \int_M \eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} e^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_{N^2-2}} \wedge F^{i_{N^2-1}}(A), \quad (4)$$

where

$$\eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} = f_{i_1 k_1}^{k_0} f_{i_2 k_2}^{k_1} f_{i_3 k_3}^{k_2} \dots f_{i_{N^2-1} k_0}^{k_{N^2-2}} \quad (5)$$

is a tensor of rank $N^2 - 1$ on the Lie algebra. This tensor has an antisymmetric part proportional to the internal Levi-Civita tensor. ($i_1, \dots, i_{N^2-1}$ are $su(N)$ indices, and f_{jk}^i are the

structure constants). Like (1), this action is invariant under all general coordinate transformations, and under the Yang-Mills gauge transformations $\delta_\Lambda e^i = f^i_{jk} e^j \Lambda^k$ and $\delta_\Lambda A^i = D\Lambda^i$, where D is the covariant derivative of A .

To study the dynamics further let us consider the Hamiltonian formulation of the action (4). Assuming that the N^2 dimensional manifold is $M = \Sigma \times R$ where Σ is a compact space, choose coordinates (x^0, x^a) on M such that $x^0 \in R$, and the $t = \text{constant}$ surfaces are slices with the topology of Σ . Let

$$\tilde{\epsilon}^{a_1 \dots a_{N^2-1}} = \tilde{\epsilon}^{0a_1 \dots a_{N^2-1}}, \quad (6)$$

be the Levi-Civita tensor density on Σ , where the right hand side is the same density on M , and

$$\tilde{e} = \frac{1}{(N^2 - 1)!} \eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} \tilde{\epsilon}^{a_1 \dots a_{N^2-1}} \left(e_{a_1}^{i_1} \dots e_{a_{N^2-1}}^{i_{N^2-1}} \right) \quad (7)$$

be the determinant of the fields e_a^i . Assuming that this “spatial” determinant does not vanish, we can define the dual fields

$$e_i^a = \frac{1}{\tilde{e}} \eta_{ii_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}} \tilde{\epsilon}^{aa_1 \dots a_{N^2-2}} \left(e_{a_1}^{i_1} \dots e_{a_{N^2-2}}^{i_{N^2-2}} \right), \quad (8)$$

which satisfy the expected relations $e_a^i e_i^b = \delta_a^b$ and $e_i^a e_a^j = \delta_i^j$. With the additional definitions

$$N^a = e_0^i e_i^a \quad (9)$$

and

$$\Lambda^i = A_0^i - N^a A_a^i, \quad (10)$$

the action (4) becomes

$$S_{N^2} = \int_R dx^0 \int_\Sigma d^{N^2-1}x \left[\tilde{e}_i^a A_a^i - N^a \tilde{H}_a - \Lambda^i \tilde{G}_i \right], \quad (11)$$

where

$$\tilde{G}_i = \partial_a \tilde{e}_i^a + f_i^{jk} A_a^j \tilde{e}_k^a, \quad (12)$$

$$\tilde{H}_a = F_{ab}^i - A_a^i \tilde{G}_i. \quad (13)$$

This is the desired Hamiltonian action. The indices a are now associated with Σ and the phase space variables are the pairs $(A_a^i, \tilde{e}_i^a)$. Varying the action with respect to the Λ^i and N^a gives the constraints

$$\tilde{G}_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{H}_a = 0. \quad (14)$$

The Hamiltonian is a linear combination of constraints as expected for a generally covariant theory. However, as is manifest, there is no constraint corresponding to time reparametrization invariance. This feature is also present in the 4-dimensional theory studied in Ref. [1].

The two sets of constraints (12) and (13) are first class and, as expected, generate respectively Yang-Mills and spatial diffeomorphisms on the phase space variables. These are the kinematical constraints in the Ashtekar canonical variables [5].

Since there are $(N^2 - 1)^2$ configuration degrees of freedom A_a^i , and $2(N^2 - 1)$ first class constraints per space point, the theory has

$$(N^2 - 1)(N^2 - 3) \quad (15)$$

local degrees of freedom. This is significantly more than the $N^2(N^2 - 3)/2$ of local degrees of freedom of general relativity in N^2 spacetime dimensions.

The result that the Hamiltonian constraint is identically zero in this theory may be understood from the covariant point of view. Recall that the Hamiltonian constraint of general relativity arises as the projection of the field equations along a timelike direction. In the present case the vector density

$$\tilde{u}^a = \frac{1}{(N^2 - 1)!} \eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} \tilde{\epsilon}^{aa_1 \dots a_{N^2-1}} \left(e_{a_1}^{i_1} \dots e_{a_{N^2-1}}^{i_{N^2-1}} \right) \quad (16)$$

satisfies $\tilde{u}^a e_a^i = 0$, and defines a special “timelike” direction on M .

We will now show that the projection of the covariant field equations along this direction vanishes identically. Varying (4) with respect to e_a^i and projecting along $\tilde{u}^a$ gives

$$\eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} e^{i_2} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_{N^2-2}} \wedge \tilde{F}^{i_{N^2-1}} = 0, \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{F}_a^i = F_{ab}^i \tilde{u}^b$. Now because $\tilde{F}_a^i \tilde{u}^a = 0$, we can write

$$\tilde{F}_a^i = \tilde{F}_j^i e_a^j. \quad (18)$$

Finally, with $\tilde{F}_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}j} := \eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} \tilde{F}_j^{i_{N^2-1}}$, eqn. (17) becomes

$$(e^{i_2} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_{N^2-2}} \wedge e^j) \tilde{F}_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}j} = 0. \quad (19)$$

Now $\tilde{F}_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}j}$ is antisymmetric in the first $N^2 - 2$ indices by definition. However, it must also be symmetric in the last $N^2 - 2$ indices for Eqn. (19) to hold. This means that $\tilde{F}_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}j} \equiv 0$, and hence $F_{ab}^i \tilde{u}^b \equiv 0$. Thus, the projection of this equation of motion along $\tilde{u}$ vanishes identically. The same result holds for the other equation of motion

$$\eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} D \wedge e^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_{N^2-2}} = 0. \quad (20)$$

The vanishing of these projections is the covariant reason that the Hamiltonian constraint is absent, or more precisely, identically satisfied, in the canonical theory.

The 4-dimensional theory [1] has been completely quantized via a “lattice” method [4]. In this approach, holonomies of the connection in various representations (“colors”) of $SU(2)$ are associated with the edges of a graph embedded in Σ . From this collection of holonomies, Gauss law invariant states are constructed by forming gauge scalars by summing over group indices using “intertwining” matrices ($6 - j$, $9 - j$, symbols etc.), which are associated with the nodes of the graph. This means that the colors which meet at a node must be compatible

with the usual angular momentum addition rules. This procedure gives the so called spin-network states [6,7]. Thus, the links of the graph carry colors, and the nodes carry group index contraction information. Finally, spatial diffeomorphism invariant states are formed by “summing” over the diffeomorphism group. In the final picture, this effectively amounts to the labelling of physical states by quantities associated with the equivalence classes of graphs under spatial diffeomorphisms. The diffeomorphism invariant information labelling graph states consists of group representations associated with the edges, and intertwining matrices associated with the nodes of a graph. This is what is expected intuitively: diffeomorphisms cannot “break up, recolor, and resum” the edges of graphs, or alter the intertwining matrices.

An exactly analogous treatment of the higher dimensional theories discussed above is possible. The only real difference is the replacement of $SU(2)$ by $SU(N)$, and the corresponding replacement of Gauss law invariant states by $SU(N)$ spin-networks. The construction of diffeomorphism invariant states remains unaltered.

It is possible to couple matter fields to the action (4). Since an invertible metric is not available, the coupling is unusual. Nevertheless it has the property that a matter current appears with the spatial diffeomorphism constraint in the canonical theory in the expected way.

Scalar field coupling is achieved by adding to the action the term [8]

$$S[e, \phi, \pi] = \int_M d^{N^2} x \tilde{u}^a \pi \partial_a \phi, \quad (21)$$

where $\tilde{u}^a$ is given by Eqn. (16). The momentum conjugate to ϕ is $\tilde{\Pi} = \tilde{u}^0 \pi$, and the the diffeomorphism constraint has the additional piece $\tilde{\Pi} \partial_a \phi$.

There is a similar coupling to a doublet ψ^i and χ^i of $SU(N)$ matter fields, obtained by adding to the action (4) the term

$$S[A, e; \psi, \chi] = \int_M d^{N^2} x \tilde{u}^a k_{ij} \chi^i D_a \psi^j, \quad (22)$$

where D is the covariant derivative of A . The momentum conjugate to ψ^i is $\tilde{P}_\psi^i = \tilde{u}^0 \chi^i$, and now the Gauss law also acquires a source term $f_{jk}^i \tilde{P}_\psi^j \psi^k$.

Finally, a coupling to “Rarita-Schwinger” $SU(N)$ fields (π_a^i, ψ_a^i) is also possible, and is achieved with the term

$$S[e, A; \pi, \psi] = \int_M \eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-1}} e^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_{N^2-3}} \wedge \pi^{i_{N^2-2}} \wedge D \wedge \psi^{i_{N^2-1}}. \quad (23)$$

This is similar to a coupling to two component spinors introduced for the $SU(2)$ theory [9].

Quantization of the four-dimensional $SU(2)$ theory with matter couplings has been discussed [10,11]. For the case of scalar and $SU(N)$ spinors, it is evident that a similar approach will work in higher dimensions. For the Rarita-Schwinger type fields, however, a generalization would be necessary because of the spatial indices carried by these fields.

So far we have discussed a theory similar to (1), but in higher dimensions, which does not have the Hamiltonian constraint in its canonical formulation. It is possible to add this constraint by hand to the Hamiltonian theory given above. It has the form

$$\tilde{e}_i^a \tilde{e}_j^b F_{ab}^k f_k^{ij} = 0, \quad (24)$$

which is identical to that for gravity in four dimensions in the Ashtekar variables. The constraint algebra remains first class, and is identical to the four dimensional case.

Although adding the constraint (24) by hand does give a classically consistent system, there are in fact higher dimensional $SU(N)$ actions for which this can be achieved directly. Consider the action

$$S^{N^2-1} = \int_M \eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}} e^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_{N^2-3}} \wedge F^{i_{N^2-2}}(A). \quad (25)$$

This is similar to (4), but with the differences that the Lagrangian density is an $(N^2 - 1)$ -form and $\eta_{i_1 \dots i_{N^2-2}}$ is an antisymmetric tensor of rank $N^2 - 2$. The metric is now no longer degenerate since there are $(N^2 - 1)$ fields e_a^i , in the same number of dimensions. For $N = 2$, $\eta_{i_1 i_2} = f_{i_1 k_1}^{k_0} f_{i_2 k_0}^{k_1} = k_{i_1 i_2}$ is the Cartan metric, and (25) is just the action of 3-dimensional gravity.

Being first order in derivatives, it is straightforward to construct the Hamiltonian version of this theory. The canonical theory does contain the time diffeomorphism constraint (24). To see this vary (25) with respect to e_0^i (the “time” component of e_a^i). This gives the $N^2 - 1$ constraints

$$\eta_{ii_1 \dots i_{N^2-3}} \tilde{\epsilon}^{a_1 \dots a_{N^2-2}} \left(e_{a_1}^{i_1} \dots e_{a_{N^2-4}}^{i_{N^2-4}} \right) F_{a_{N^2-3} a_{N^2-2}}^{i_{N^2-3}} = 0, \quad (26)$$

where all the world indices are spatial. This contains the spatial diffeomorphism and Hamiltonian constraints. To extract these as functions of the canonical variables, note first that the momentum conjugate to the connection is

$$\tilde{e}_i^a = \eta_{ii_1 \dots i_{N^2-3}} \tilde{\epsilon}^{aa_1 \dots a_{N^2-3}} \left(e_{a_1}^{i_1} \dots e_{a_{N^2-3}}^{i_{N^2-3}} \right). \quad (27)$$

Therefore, contracting (26) with e_b^i (where the index b is spatial) gives the $N^2 - 2$ constraints

$$\tilde{e}_i^a F_{ab}^i = 0. \quad (28)$$

Noting that A_0^i is the lagrange multiplier for the Gauss law, the combination (13) gives the spatial diffeomorphism constraint. To extract the Hamiltonian constraint in the form (24), we must contract the free index i in Eqn. (26) to get a scalar density. This is achieved by contracting (26) with

$$\eta_{ij_1 \dots j_{N^2-2}} \tilde{\epsilon}^{b_1 \dots b_{N^2-2}} \left(e_{b_1}^{j_1} \dots e_{b_{N^2-2}}^{j_{N^2-2}} \right), \quad (29)$$

and simplifying.

Finally, note that although the algebra of constraints of this $SU(N)$ theory is identical to that for four dimensional general relativity, it has more degrees of freedom than the latter. There are of course first order actions for general relativity of exactly the form (25), and therefore *with* a Hamiltonian constraint, for gauge group $SO(N - 1, 1)$. However their canonical formulations are no simpler than the usual metric variables due to the presence of second class constraints [12]. The point of the $SU(N)$ action in the relevant dimension is that the canonical theory has *exactly* the same constraints and algebra as the inherently four-dimensional Ashtekar variables.

In summary, we have made the following observations: (i) There are diffeomorphism invariant $SU(N)$ gauge theories in N^2 dimensions such that their Hamiltonian versions do not have a time reparametrization constraint, (ii) although the metric is degenerate, there is a prescription for matter couplings, (iii) full quantization along the lines of [4] seems possible, and, (iv) In $N^2 - 1$ dimensions, there are $SU(N)$ theories which have the canonical constraint algebra of general relativity, but have more degrees of freedom than the latter theory in the same dimensions.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Husain and K. V. Kuchar, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 4070 (1990).
- [2] M. Banados, L. J. Garay, and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rev. D **53**, R593; Nucl. Phys. B476, 611 (1996).
- [3] M. Banados, M. Henneaux, C. Iannuzzo, and C. M. Viallet, Class. Quantum. Grav. **14**, 2455 (1997).
- [4] A. Ashtekar, J. Lewandowski, D. Marolf, J. Mourao, and T. Thiemann, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6456 (1995).
- [5] A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2244 (1986); Phys. Rev. **D36**, 2170 (1987).
- [6] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5743 (1995).
- [7] J. Baez, Adv. Math. Phys. **117**, 253 (1996).
- [8] V. Husain, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 5394 (1993).
- [9] V. Husain, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 7849 (1995).
- [10] T. Thiemann, Class. Quantum Gravity **15**, 1487 (1998).
- [11] J. Baez and K. Krasnov, J. Math. Phys. **39**, 1251 (1998).
- [12] A. Ashtekar, A. P. Balachandran, and S. Jo, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A4**, 1493 (1989).